

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,514	03/10/2004	Elmar Kraus	14503-003001 / F62554US 4007	
26191 7:	590 03/09/2006		EXAMI	NER
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.			KIM, SUN U	
PO BOX 1022				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1723	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/797,514	KRAUS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John Kim	1723			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time Till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 M	arch 2004.				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-53</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) <u>1-53</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
\ttnahmaut/a\					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) 🔲 lataa da (0aaaaaa	(DTO 442)			
Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te			
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1723

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-18 and 53, drawn to the use of recombinant HSA, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- II. Claims 19-28, drawn to dialysate liquid, classified in class 424, subclass 600.
- III. Claims 29-36, drawn to membrane, classified in class 210, subclass 500.21.
- IV. Claims 37-40, drawn to disposable set, classified in class 210, subclass 321.6.
- V. Claims 41-52, drawn to method for separation of protein-bound substances, classified in class 210, subclass 650.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II or III or IV or V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different designs, modes of operation and effects. Invention I is a recombinant HSA. Invention II is a dialysate liquid. Invention III is a membrane. Invention IV is a disposable set. Invention V is a method of separating protein bound substances.

Inventions II and III or IV or V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different designs, modes of operation and effects.

Application/Control Number: 10/797,514

Art Unit: 1723

Invention II is a dialysate liquid. Invention III is a membrane. Invention IV is a disposable set. Invention V is a method of separating protein bound substances.

Inventions III and IV or V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different designs, modes of operation and effects.

Invention III is a membrane. Invention IV is a disposable set. Invention V is a method of separating protein bound substances.

Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different designs, modes of operation and effects. Invention IV is a disposable set. Invention V is a method of separating protein bound substances.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: Species 1: claim 39 and Species 2: claim 40. The species are independent or distinct because Species 1 uses a dialyzer without filling of dialysate liquid side with HSA and Species 2 uses dialyzer with filling of dialysate side with HSA.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 37 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: Species I) Claim 41

Species II) claim 43.

The species are independent or distinct because Species I uses a dialysis membrane and Species II uses a membrane comprising two functionally different parts.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims

Application/Control Number: 10/797,514

Art Unit: 1723

١

readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/797,514 Page 6

Art Unit: 1723

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a

request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to John Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1142.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached on (571) 272-1151. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John Kim

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1723

J. Kim March 6, 2006